



*Comments by
June 25*

United States Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Position Paper

~~BLM/FWS
INTERAGENCY LIBRARY~~

ANALYSIS, REVIEW, and RECOMMENDATIONS

of

"Off-Road Vehicles on Public Lands"

Council on Environmental Quality

1979

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

Task Force members: Richard Barbar
Jerry Boggs
George Detsis
Mark Lawrence
Jerry Harrell
Steve Smith

June 8, 1979

BLM LIBRARY
DENVER, CO 80225

BLM Library
Denver Federal Center
Bldg. 85, OC-521
P.O. Box 25047
Denver, CO 80225

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the following:

Richard Barbar - California State Office - Chief, Branch of Recreation and Special Areas - BLM

Jerry Boggs - Wildlife Biologist - Bakersfield District - BLM

George Detsis - ORV Management Specialist - Riverside District - BLM

Mark Lawrence - Area Manager - Diablo Resource Area - Folsom District - BLM

Jerry Harrell - Chief, Office of Public Affairs - California State Office - BLM

Steve Smith - California State Office - State Staff Ranger - BLM

Administrative

This report was prepared by the following:

Research Section - Chief and Staff Officer - Chief, Research Section
and Special Agent - SLM

Legal Section - Chief and Staff Officer - Chief, Legal Section - SLM

General Investigation - Chief and Staff Officer - Chief, General Investigation - SLM

Identification - Chief and Staff Officer - Chief, Identification - SLM
Bureau - SLM

Training - Chief, Office of Training - Chief, Training - SLM
Office - SLM

Other - Chief and Staff Officer - Chief, Other - SLM

Table of Contents

- I Introduction
- II General Overview of C.E.Q. Report
- III Status of BLM ORV Management
 - A. Organized ORV Event Management
 - B. Environmental Awareness
 - C. Legislative Mandates
 - D. Political Considerations
 - E. Monitoring
 - F. Cooperative Relations and Public Involvement
 - G. Rehabilitation
 - H. Management of Unorganized ORV Use
 - I. Enforcement Capability
 - J. Summary of Significant Problems
- IV. Analysis of CEQ "What is to be Done"
 - 1. Recognize Magnitude of Enforcement Problem
 - 2. Determine How the Public Wants Land Used
 - 3. Stiffen the Federal Land Managers' Backbones
 - 4. Separate Motorized Recreational from Other Uses
 - 5. Monitor ORV Effects
 - 6. Develop Facilities through Pittman-Robertson Approach
 - 7. Reclaim ORV-Damaged Land
- V. Recommendations
 - A. Develop a Comprehensive Off-Road Vehicle Management Program within the Bureau
 - 1. Greater Program Emphasis
 - 2. Comprehensive ORV Management
 - 3. ORV Management Policies
 - B. Interim Management
 - 1. Interim Management Plan
 - 2. Open-Area EARs
 - 3. Enforcement and Education
 - 4. Monitoring
 - 5. Rehabilitation
 - C. Baseline Studies

1. Scope of the ORV Phenomenon
2. Environmental Impacts of ORVs
3. Sociological Data on Perceptions and Preferences
4. Reclamation and Rehabilitation
5. Depreciative Behavior
6. Ways of Mitigating Impacts
7. Computer Simulation Modeling of Alternative Land-Use Strategies
8. HCRS Coordination of Base Line Studies

D. Support Needs

1. Congress
2. CEQ
3. Department of the Interior

E. Summary

I. Introduction

The phenomenon of off-road vehicle use on the public lands has been recognized as one of the by-products of the technological advances of this century. During the past 12 to 14 years recreational and subsistence oriented use of motorized off-highway machines has burgeoned and then leveled off. The novelty and challenge for the motorized recreationist has provided grist for numerous studies and research projects both governmental and privately sponsored. Some have analyzed the behavioral aspects, others the resource and environmental impacts - but little, if any, comprehensive analysis of the total ORV situation has been conducted.

The Bureau of Land Management has been involved since the onset of the ORV situation. Initial reactions to the fast growing recreational use of ORV's by BLM managers, traditionally geared to dealing with forestry, grazing, realty, wildlife, watershed and minerals uses, were uncertain and tentative. Agency policies and management procedures were understandably reactive and always slow to keep up with the increasing management problems related to ORV use.

The report "Off Road Vehicles on Public Land" prepared for the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) is a timely reminder of the seriousness of this use. It should stimulate the Bureau to reassess, after a decade under the National Environmental Policy Act, and after a decade of experience in dealing with the advocates and antagonists of ORV use, its ORV management policies and chart a comprehensive program of ORV management for the years to come.

This should not be construed to imply that the Bureau has been totally or willfully negligent in its responsibilities. Although we have obviously underestimated the problem, many dedicated professionals have labored long and hard in innovating ORV management techniques and developing procedural guidelines to deal with the situation. Some have succeeded - some have not. In any attempt at assessing what the environmental impacts of ORV use may be to date, one must also consider what they might have been without the management actions which have taken place.

The intent of this paper is to neither refute the allegations of the CEQ report nor to further substantiate them. Rather, it is this Task Force's purpose to use the CEQ report as a springboard to better management of an increasingly important and controversial use of the public lands. This position paper will illustrate the past and present steps BLM is using to manage ORV use, it will attempt to illustrate the complexities of managing the public lands under the multiple-use concept, and finally (and perhaps most importantly) it will present

a series of recommendations which, if implemented, would lead to coordinated, orderly and effective management of off-road vehicular use of the public lands.

The Task Force preparing this report unanimously agrees on several major factors: greater Bureauwide emphasis on ORV program management; increased baseline data to determine ORV impacts; development of Bureauwide monitoring procedures; positive programs of rehabilitation and reclamation; initiate Environmental Awareness programs for ORV users; provision of needed authorities and regulations for effective enforcement of ORV related laws, and the development, at the highest levels, of ORV program goals and objectives.

All of these can only be met with appropriate action from Congress, the ORV industry, the ORV users and the Bureau of Land Management. In the CEQ report Chairman, Charles Warren states in the Foreward that CEQ "... stands ready to help..." The Bureau of Land Management actively solicits that assistance.

II. General Overview of the C.E.Q. Report

The utilization of public lands by off-road vehicle (ORV) enthusiasts has been and is recognized by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management as a legitimate use. Those several millions of individuals who recreate in this manner rightfully expect the various land management agencies to provide for this use of the public lands.

At the same time, BLM recognizes the destructive nature of this form of recreation and the dangers it poses to the land resource. It is cognizant also of the several (sometimes conflicting) regulations, executive orders, policy decisions, and laws which regulate this and other uses of the public lands.

The recent publication (1979) by the CEQ titled "Off-Road Vehicles on Public Lands," highlights the severity of the ORV problem, both in terms of resource degradation and resource management. It is unfortunate that the report takes an accusatory, predominantly negative, and unbalanced approach to off-road vehicular use. While the title suggests a general discussion of ORV's, the text generally accentuates the negative aspects. One wonders at the absence of meaningful discussion on possible positive aspects, e.g., subsistence-related use (ranching, mining, trapping, etc.), the value of ORV use as an emotional outlet, economic benefits, etc. It is disturbing also to note the relative omission of discussion on those positive steps the land management agencies have taken in an attempt to begin management of ORV use, i.e., the innovative and inter-disciplinary approach of California's Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Council process,

the positive benefits of the Interim Critical Management Program of the California Desert, the closure of certain areas, the development of BLM "option" courses, the development of the BLM Ranger program, etc.

Certain inaccuracies within the CEQ report may damage its credibility, e.g., contrary to the report, the Panoche Hills no longer sustain significant ORV use. Nor is it very accurate to suggest that the Panoche Hills comprise a sizeable portion of the range of the blunt-nosed leopard lizard, an endangered species. These hills comprise considerably less than 10% of the known range of that species.

The apparently biased selection of the very worst examples of ORV degradation as representative of the general picture, as well as the lumping of several classes of off-road vehicles into a monolithic destructive force, also reduces the effectiveness of this report, especially with the ORV users. The rather shallow treatment of the complex realities of modern land management does not do credit to the efforts of agencies such as BLM and the U.S. Forest Service.

Another item the report did not discuss adequately is the diversity among vehicles, ORV users and the types of uses. The report tended to lump all ORV users into one group which is not the case. In our ORV Management Programs we have identified a large variety of recreation vehicles, users and uses which follow:

<u>Vehicles</u>	<u>Users</u>	<u>Uses</u>
1. Motorcycles		
a. Competition	Competitors	Races or time events, i.e., hare and hound, hare scrambles, motorcross and enduros
b. Noncompetitive	Trail riders	Group trail rides of over 50 bikers
c. Free play	Recreational	General use or at pit areas during races
d. Recreational trailbiking	Families, sight-seers, hunters, fishermen, etc.	Family enjoyment, scenery access, hunting, fishing, camping, etc.

2. Four-Wheel Drive

a. Factory equipped (Jeeps, Blazers, Broncos, multi-passenger, pickups)

Families, sight-seers, hunters,

Family enjoyment, scenery access,

Government agencies

Management of resources, fire suppression, Search and Rescue

b. Modified for competition

Competitors

Hill climbs, cross country races, sand dunes, etc.

3. Dune Buggies

General recreationists or competitors

Enjoyment of dunes or races, sand dune climbs, etc.

a. Baja bugs

Competitors

Cross country races, sand dunes

4. All Terrain Vehicles (ATV) - 3 wheelers

General recreationists

Indiscriminant use on dunes, some trails

5. Sand dragsters

Competitors

High Speed travel over sand dunes on a straight course of specific length.

6. Land speed vehicles

Competitive

Setting land speed records on dry lakebeds or salt flats.

Not only is there a wide diversity of vehicles, users and uses but through an interchange of equipment such as sprockets on motorcycles and tires on both motorcycles and 4-wheel drives and dune buggies, a vehicle can accomplish several different activities in an area, i.e., traverse sand dunes, cross country races, climb hills, etc. What the vehicle is equipped to do therefore can determine the type of impact it can have. Once the vehicle is equipped, then the impact occurs from the person using it and what they use it for. As an example, a hunter using a motorcycle or 4-wheel drive to get to a hunting area would normally use existing

roads and trails at slower speeds than a person in a competitive event who is racing to win in the fastest time or over a timed course. Their vehicles would also be equipped quite differently. Competitors would generally be on more primitive trails than a hunter also. Thus the impact can vary greatly. Therefore in order for ORV management to be effective the diversity of the vehicles, people and uses must be taken into consideration, not only for recreation use but all ORV use.

Despite the various shortcomings of the CEQ report, the Task Force is in agreement with, and supports its main conclusions, i.e., unmanaged or mismanaged off-road vehicular use of the land has been and is severely damaging to several resource values, and ORV use is not presently being managed effectively.

A review of the present ongoing off-road vehicle management program will cite many of the positive steps the Bureau has taken in an effort to foster a climate of understanding between managers and users, and reduce environmental impacts.

III. Status of BLM Off-Road Vehicle Management

Many management actions relative to off-road vehicle use have taken place to date. The following depicts the more important actions:

A. Organized Off-Road Vehicle Event Management

One important aspect of the ORV phenomenon has been the cooperation stimulated by BLM and the U.S. Forest Service in working closely with organized ORV clubs. Nationwide, these clubs acquire federal permits to promote, organize and conduct ORV events on federal lands. For example, on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the California Desert Conservation Area, approximately 100 permits, involving some 60,000 ORV enthusiasts, are issued on an annual basis.

Clubs desiring to sponsor either a competitive or noncompetitive (i.e., "trailride involving 50 or more vehicles") ORV event are required to work closely with federal multiple use agencies.

This involves completion of an application with a \$10 nonrefundable application fee, supplying the agency with a proposed course map, acquiring insurance and consent in writing from private land owners to cross private lands, and many times, supplying either a surety or performance bond. In turn, through environmental assessment of each proposed ORV event, the BLM and USFS are able to point out environmentally sensitive areas along the proposed course, thus possibly revising the course route or providing for mitigating measures.

Although many actions have allowed ORV use under permit, the Bureau has also closed areas to ORV use to protect endangered resource values. Examples are the Desert Tortoise Natural Area and Eureka Dunes Natural Area. Lawsuit filed to protest some closures have supported BLM's actions.

Besides working with identified 4 wheel drive and motorcycle clubs, the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service have the opportunity to effectively manage organized ORV events. Therefore, the issuance of a permit reduces the potential for environmental degradation. Without question, the permit system has been a successful tool for reaching a segment of the ORV community and creating a cooperative climate for use.

B. Environmental Awareness

Another important program entails various interpretative facilities and environmental awareness programs.

The BLM promotes several "Desert Awareness programs" annually. Much to the enjoyment of participating 4-wheelers and motorcyclists, these desert awareness programs have served as an educational tool and opened a new channel of understanding between the ORVers and the land managers. ORVers are better able to appreciate the need for protecting fragile desert resources. Beyond these well attended awareness programs, both the BLM and USFS have developed several visitor information centers. The BLM's Barstow Way Station attracts nearly 30,000 visitors annually, most of which are ORV users of public lands and two more way stations are planned in Southern California.

Finally, BLM staff commonly attend ORV evening club meetings and provide talks on the agency's policies and overall programs. These talks help to create a better understanding between the agencies and users in attempting to rationally resolve differences or misunderstandings.

C. Legislative Mandates

The basic mandates of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act; the National Environmental Policy Act; Sikes Act; and Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 outline policy and direction to the land managing agencies. In many instances these laws and directives are conflicting. Regulations to fully implement the laws have not been promulgated. Enforcement authority has yet to be effectively delegated.

D. Political Considerations

Political concerns are as polarized as public values relative to the ORV issue. Passage of local and state statutes, pro and con, are happening on a continual basis. This polarization of political representation makes it even more difficult to make objective land use decisions relative to ORV areas and ORV management.

E. Monitoring

Monitoring of general ORV impacts is not as widespread as needed, but it has been used by various BLM districts to determine the effects of organized events. Most consisted of photo points for taking pre and post event photographs to determine the impacts on soils and vegetation. The most detailed monitoring to date, occurred on a competitive event in the Riverside, California District which receives the greatest impacts from ORV's in the Bureau. In 1974, during the Barstow to Las Vegas race monitoring of air quality, soil displacement, and the effects on vegetation and wildlife occurred.

This Environmental Impact Statement subsequently was commended by CEQ for thoroughness and professionalism. While several studies have evaluated the impacts of ORV use on specific resources e.g., soil, wildlife, air, etc., these have generally not been area specific nor related to specific ORV types or specific events nor has the monitoring been comprehensive (e.g., all resource impacts of a special event) or systematic. Little follow-up monitoring of Environmental Assessment Records to evaluate predicted impacts has been conducted.

F. Cooperative Relations and Public Involvement

Use of ORV's on the public lands is a very emotional issue and as such produces a strong polarization effect on groups who support it or are against it. The Bureau, on the basis of its multiple use management mandate, attempts to communicate with all of the various groups on not only ORV use, but other resource uses. Thus one of the best positions the Bureau can take is to serve as an intermediary to bring these various groups together and establish a line of communication to result in effective management. Multiple use advisory boards have worked well in this effort in the past, and will receive increased emphasis

in the future. On-the-Ground tours are also a successful tool which allow various groups (i.e., ranchers, environmentalists, ORV users, etc.) of diverse resource interests to discuss their viewpoints on the public lands, and learn about other group's viewpoints. The end result in most cases is a finding that their goals for using the lands are quite similar, i.e., satisfying a recreational experience although they are looking at it from very different viewpoints.

Public involvement has been an integral part of the Bureau of Land Management's off-road vehicle program from the outset. Shortly after the problem of uncontrolled ORV use of the public lands of California was identified in the late 1960's, the BLM State Director presented the issue to the State Multiple-Use Advisory Board. The next step was to establish a special ad hoc advisory committee representing the full spectrum of interests and uses of the public lands to assist the Bureau in drafting guidelines for management of off-road vehicles on public lands. The Off-Road Vehicle Advisory Council (ORVAC) proposed a set of guidelines based on designation of lands as open, restricted, or closed depending on the resources of the areas. That approach was reflected two years later in Executive Order 11644 and has influenced virtually all subsequent management proposals.

The executive order spurred development of guidelines for management of competitive and other organized events. Lacking law enforcement authority or other specific power to regulate such, BLM met the challenge to its authority through civil court actions and a sustained public information and education effort.

In addition to ORVAC, BLM's state and district multiple-use advisory boards continued to provide a public forum for discussion of and involvement in vehicle management.

Concurrently with BLM's continuing efforts in California, proposed rulemaking to implement E.O. 11644 was issued nationally. Once again, widespread public involvement was sought and nearly 5,000 people attended the series of public meetings held to obtain public input. Based on public reaction these regulations were ruled invalid by court order.

In June, 1973 BLM began another round of public participation, this time to develop an interim management plan for the California Desert. A series of open houses attended by some 800 persons launched the effort. A preliminary draft plan was disseminated to 70,000 interested citizens through user groups, conservation-environmental organizations, direct mail and a series of mobile display units that visited 15 Southern California

communities. More than 22,000 individuals responded to the draft plan. Comments came from conservation organizations, user groups, elected officials, desert community leaders and other federal, state and local agencies.

The resulting "Interim Critical Management Program" or ICMP was announced October 31, 1973. Widespread public involvement also took place the following year when the program was revised. Newspaper advertisements, news releases, mailouts and individuals contacts with organizations stimulated more than 1,900 public comments.

Additional public input and involvement resulted from the environmental assessment process. Environmental statements or Environmental assessment records (EAR's) were prepared on major events, and public review and comment had been sought.

G. Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation of ORV use areas has been minimal on public lands. Where it has occurred, it has mainly consisted of regrading trails after competitive events without any replanting of vegetation. One area where a general rehabilitation program was conducted with demonstrated success was the Panoche Hills in the California Coast Range. Within the 1100 acres impacted by vehicles, all damaged areas under 30% slope were contour furrowed and seeded to saltbrush (Atriplex polycarpa) and a variety of perennial grasses to control erosion. Although the perennial grasses did poorly, the saltbrush did very well and today it, and annual grasses common to the area, completely cover the sites leaving no sign of the motorcycle trails. On slopes over 30%, a ball and chain was pulled over the area by a caterpillar tractor to to scarify the soil which was then seeded to perennial grasses. Results were disappointing due to non-establishment of perennial grasses. Today however, annual grasses have come back in these test areas and only signs of the major trails exist where erosion is still occurring. In these areas the erosion has been used to advantage by the California Department of Fish and Game. Under cooperative agreement with the Bureau, they have constructed silt catchment basins below the trails which fill up with soil and are then planted to saltbrush. The brush provides nesting and escape cover for upland game birds and other wildlife. Game bird populations have done well since the closure to ORV's and the hills have become a popular hunting area.

The 1100 acres in the Panoche Hills was also closed to grazing. It was grazed temporarily this year in order to reduce fire danger from a very heavy growth of grass.

The endangered blunt-nosed leopard lizard has been seen in the Panoche Hills which is the northern limits of its habitat. An inventory is presently occurring to determine its population levels.

As mentioned, the Panoche Hills are located in the California Coast Range. The same techniques and revegetation procedures used there may not be applicable to desert or forested areas.

H. Management of Unorganized ORV Use

The majority of ORVers recreating on federal lands are not partaking in organized competitive or noncompetitive events, but are involved in unorganized, indiscriminant recreational activities. It appears that the organized ORV users are creating the cumulative environmental impacts. Federal land management agencies have been relatively unsuccessful in educating these often "hard to reach" users, as opposed to the organized ORV groups where management controls are more effective.

Various studies have indicated that as much as 70% of recreationists utilizing national forests are unorganized, indiscriminant users. The impacts by these unorganized users have, over the long run, been very damaging to the environment due to their cumulative effects. It is essential that greater management efforts be directed towards the unorganized ORV users.

Additionally, greater control of non-participating spectator vehicles situated along the course route of organized events also needs to be emphasized. Many times more environmental damage is caused by spectators and their vehicles than by the competitors themselves. For example, the annual running of the SCORE Parker 400 attracts approximately 16,000 spectators. The Bureau has attempted to control these spectators and their associated impacts by identifying various spectator viewing areas along the two course loops which total over 200 miles. However, the job of spectator control is a great challenge when one considers approximately 200 miles of course which is easily accessible from practically any point in a desert environment, 16,000 spectators, and a total force of 15 federal employees assigned to the Parker 400 event basically for the purpose of observation.

I. Enforcement Capability

The ability of BLM to enforce off-road vehicle management policies is a contingent on having adequate development of field patrol personnel with enforcement authority. Currently,

there are very few such employees - only 17 rangers for the California Desert Conservation Area and 15 Special Agents within the Bureau. To date, citation authority has not been delegated to the BLM making enforcement capability cumbersome.

Special Agents have investigative responsibility for all types of violations of federal laws and can only devote time to the most serious, acute ORV problem areas. Full time field patrol personnel Rangers - are only authorized in the California Desert and some limited adjacent areas where there are an average of one million acres of public land per ranger. The Bureau's ranger staff provides an important communication link in the field. They protect resources and educate ORV users. Statistics show BLM personnel, primarily rangers and visitor use specialists, have personal contacts with nearly 40,000 public land visitors in California annually.

J. Summary of Significant Problems

The seemingly exponential growth of ORV use has surpassed the management capability of both BLM and the Forest Service. Although aware of the increasing conflict between this and other resource values, land managers to date have not been able to satisfactorily cope with it. There are several problems which must be addressed and answered before effective management of the ORV program can begin:

1. There is insufficient data to evaluate the management alternatives between "no use" and "severe land degradation."
2. There is no coordinated approach or policy on how to deal with those unorganized, individualized, ORV users who comprise the great majority of that group.
3. There is an extreme polarization of views on this subject by the different publics. This polarization leads to hard-line attitudes on both sides, making viable management of the program even more difficult.
4. There is or appears to be a lack of awareness at several levels, e.g., public, agency and Congressional of the magnitude and urgency of the problem. This has, for example, slowed the development of an effective enforcement capability, i.e., BLM Rangers.
5. There is little information available on the potential for reclamation and rehabilitation of ORV damaged areas, few attempts to reclaim such areas have been made, few

studies on the feasibility of such attempts have been made.

6. Baseline data and impact assessment monitoring are lacking.

IV. Analysis of CEQ Report Chapter "What is to be Done."

The following analysis is intended to provide the Task Force's review and comment on the viability of the seven recommended actions in the CEQ report:

1. Recognize Magnitude of Enforcement Problem

The Task Force agrees that plans for protecting public lands and managing ORV use requires an adequate presence of field personnel with enforcement authority. We believe that BLM should continue to formulate ORV policies and then as recommended, publically announce the degree of anticipated compliance that can be achieved.

The public and responsible officials will then know that environmental damage is beyond BLM's ability to control based on the existing enforcement capability.

The agency will not then be giving an "illusion of control" and public land management priorities can be evaluated and determinations made as to whether or not programming for more effective compliance is justified.

It is a fact that BLM's field presence is totally inadequate for all of its visitor services program responsibilities including public education and awareness.

While some minor internal budget adjustments, in support of the expanding field compliance responsibilities of rangers and visitor use specialists, have been made, a major funding increase is necessary to achieve effective ORV management.

2. Determine How Public Wants Land Used

The Task Force is in complete agreement that it is important to find out how the American people in general, want their land managed. However, we also feel it relevant to determine State and/or County residents opinions and views. Local residents will be most affected by land management decisions, particularly when local economics are at stake.

Another important survey would be to sample Americans to determine how the approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ or 43.5 million Americans, engaged in some form of ORV activity annually, want federally

studies of the feasibility of such attempts have been made.

2. Baseline data and impact assessment monitoring are lacking.

Analysis of CEO Report 2, "What is to be Done?"

The following analysis is intended to provide the Task Force with a review and comment on the ability of the land management actions outlined in the CEO report.

1. Ecological Management of Endangered Wetlands

The Task Force agrees that plans for protecting public lands and managing GNV wetlands are needed. However, the plan as currently presented with current authority. We believe the plan should continue to provide GNV protection and then as recommended, publicly announce the steps to be taken to ensure that the plan can be achieved.

The public and responsible officials will then have the authority needed to ensure that the plan is carried out. The existing management capabilities.

The agency will not then be giving an "illusion of control" and public land management policies can be evaluated and if necessary made as to whether or not programming for more effective management is justified.

It is a fact that BLM's field presence is totally inadequate for the job. The agency's management responsibilities are limited. Public education and awareness.

While some minor internal budget adjustments in support of the expanding field management responsibilities of public and visitor use specialists, have been made, a major budget increase is necessary to achieve effective GNV management.

2. Determining How Public Lands are Used

The Task Force is in complete agreement that it is important to find out how the American people in general, want their land managed. However, we also feel it is important to determine State and County residents' opinions and views. Land management will be most effective if land management decisions, particularly when local resources are at stake.

Another important way would be to sample Americans to determine how the approximately 2 or 2.5 million Americans engaged in some form of GNV activity annually, want land

administered lands managed.

The CEQ report cites a USFS survey taken in Illinois and Indiana which revealed considerable opposition to motorcycle recreation. Earlier in the report reference was made that Indiana has banned ORVs from all state lands since late 1972. No opinion polls however, are cited from states which may be supportive of ORVs, particularly states such as Minnesota or Wisconsin where snowmobiling is an important wintertime recreational pursuit in addition to having major economic benefits. An opinion poll of Alaskans may reveal that the state places great importance on ORVs, not so much for recreational endeavors, but as a means of transportation or subsistence hunting by the Alaskan natives.

Finally, we concur that in all cases public opinion polls should not be the sole criteria in making land use decisions. The land manager needs to carefully weigh public sentiment with all other resource oriented factors in making decisions.

3. Stiffen the Federal Land Manager's Backbones

Actions which managers take to correct a resource problem are based on factors such as knowledge of the problem, data upon which to make a decision, effective regulations and manpower to enforce the decision, and in general cooperation from the using public. A managers' decisions then are more effective if they're based on an overall management program rather than just issuing an edict. So rather than talk about stiffening a managers' backbone a better term for this recommendation would be to develop an effective ORV management program throughout the Executive Branch. Recommended procedures for developing a program are as follows:

- a. Regulations and Designation of ORV Areas
- b. Adequate Enforcement Manpower
- c. Monitoring and Research
- d. Education and Cooperation

4. Separate Motorized Recreation from Other Uses

The Task Force is in complete agreement with this recommended point. Trails specifically designed and maintained for ORVs and snowmobiles will cause the fewest user-conflict and environmental damage. We also are in support that lands already severely damaged by surface

mining or by ORV use probably are the most likely candidates from an environmental point of view for ORV areas. Due to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-87) strip mined lands can be reclaimed to basically their original contour. With increased emphasis currently being placed on our abundance of coal reserves, reclaiming stripped land to be used as ORV areas may become widely accepted among managers and users.

5. Monitor ORV Effects

Monitoring the effects of ORV use is an objective which all land management agencies should and can meet. To a certain extent, as described in a previous section, this has been attempted. However, such attempts have been on a sporadic basis and one of the key elements in a monitoring system is its systematic approach.

Each land management agency must begin to establish monitoring systems. Such systems should be standardized and yet retain sufficient flexibility so as to be adaptable to various situations. Monitoring must be done on a systematic basis and at a minimum must address air, water, soils, vegetation and the wildlife present. It should be refined sufficiently so as to detect the different levels of impacts associated with different types, different levels, and different seasons of use. The results must be quantifiable. Finally, a monitoring system should be sufficiently responsive so as to detect and read the varying levels of impact quickly, i.e., it should enable the manager to modify ORV use within a season.

6. Develop Facilities Through Pittman-Robertson Kind of Approach

This recommendation is not new and has received considerable discussion at the early stages of the ORV situation. Obviously, any governmentally imposed tax will meet with public reaction. However, indications by users are that they are willing to pay for their use of public lands.

Although not specifically mentioned in the CEQ report the State of California requires a special registration fee for using off-road vehicles (except 4 wheel drives). The revenues derived from these funds are specifically earmarked for the development of ORV areas. In FY 1980, the state is reimbursing the BLM over \$500,000 for development of facilities and use supervision in critical areas such as Dove Springs, Jawbone Canyon and Imperial Sand Hills.

Funding of ORV management is critical. Traditional revenue producing taxation sounds easy enough but is not the only method. Innovative methods for funding need to be explored. Some of these are suggested in the recommendations section.

...to be by OCV and possibly are the most likely candidates for an environmental review of some OCV areas. Due to the fact that the OCV and the National Act of 1977 (which was 2-252) stipulate that it can be reviewed to modify their original content, this has not been done. Currently, the OCV areas are being reviewed of our interest, including the need to be used as OCV areas. They have not been accepted when presented and used.

2. National OCV Effects

Whether or not effects of OCV are an objective which all land management agencies should and can meet. In a certain extent, as described in a previous section, this has been attempted. However, such attempts have been on a sporadic basis and one of the key elements in a monitoring system is the systematic approach.

Land land management agencies must begin to establish monitoring systems. Such systems should be standardized and get a clear indication as to be applicable to various situations. Monitoring must be done on a systematic basis and on a minimum must address all water, soils, vegetation and the wildlife present. It should be well and consistently so as to ensure the different levels of impact. Systems with different types, different levels, and different systems. The results must be comparable. Finally, a monitoring system should be sufficiently expensive so as to obtain and keep the various levels of impact going and it should ensure the manager to monitor OCV for which a system.

3. The Role of the National OCV System in the National Act of 1977

This recommendation is not new and has received considerable discussion at the early stages of the OCV system. Obviously, any given individual proposed law will meet with public reaction. However, and certain by laws are that they are willing to pay for their use of public lands.

Although not explicitly mentioned in the OCV report, the State of California requires a special regulation for the use of all-wooded areas. The report is not clear. The report is derived from these areas and specifically mentioned for the development of OCV areas. In 1977, the state legislature passed the law over \$500,000 for development of public land and the supervision in critical areas such as Grove 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.

Planning of OCV management is critical. Traditional resource planning for these areas may be enough but is not the only method. Innovative methods for funding need to be explored. Some of these are suggested in the recommendations section.

7. Reclaim ORV-Damaged Land

Reclamation of ORV damaged land needs to be increased. It is done for grazing, wildlife habitat, and following fires, and should also for ORVs. Implementation of a reclamation program needs to be tied to an effective monitoring program of impacts on vegetation and soils. Some organized ORV clubs state that they would be willing to pay a fee to use the lands which would be used for reclamation. Contracts should be made with national ORV organizations on implementation of this program.

V. Recommendations

Based upon the analysis of the CEQ report and the existing situation of ORV management in BLM to date, the following recommendations are offered in an attempt to address the shortcomings and realign ineffective management.

A. Develop a comprehensive Off-Road Vehicle Management Program within the Bureau.

1. Currently, off-road vehicle management is considered a subcomponent of the Bureau's Recreation program. Related programs such as environmental assessment, resource and user studies, monitoring of impacts and rehabilitation all are part of the total ORV program management. Yet, because of the fragmented nature of funding and lack of coordination within the agency, total ORV program management is lacking. Greater program emphasis must be given. This should be accomplished by defining program goals and objectives.

B. Interim Management

1. Interim Management Plan

An Interim Management Plan to regulate ORV use over the next several years, while baseline studies (see Part C) are conducted, must be developed. It should prevent further degradation of the habitats of the major use areas and deter the expansion of significant damage into new areas. It should develop management techniques by class of vehicle and use. Perhaps most importantly, it must begin the management the "free-play" ORV users, nether competition enthusiasts nor organization members, who comprise the great majority of that user group and who, in their cumulative effects, cause the greatest damage.

that the use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases. The use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases. The use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases.

Section 507 (Continued)

Based upon the results of the 1990 report and the existing situation in the State, the following recommendations are made for the use of OGV in the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases.

A. The use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases.

The following recommendations are made for the use of OGV in the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases. The use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases. The use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases.

Section 507 (Continued)

Section 507 (Continued)

As indicated in the previous section, the use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases. The use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases. The use of OGV should be limited to the most serious cases. It is also the policy of the State to encourage the use of OGV in the most serious cases.

2. Open Area EARS

Interim Management should be tied to a new sequence of environmental assessments. The EARS done on the present "open" areas are outdated, both in terms of actual data and relevancy. These assessment procedures should either be redone or have major revisions.

3. Enforcement and Education

The field presence of the BLM Ranger force should be expanded. More rangers and visitor-use specialists are required. Upgraded enforcement capability should be coupled with an expanded effort to increase the environmental awareness of both the ORV enthusiasts as well as the general public.

4. Monitoring

Monitoring systems to detect and read the varying levels of impacts should be developed and installed in as many use areas as possible. These systems must be standardized and yet retain sufficient flexibility to be adopted to various habitats and use conditions. They must be used systematically. They must be so responsive as to enable managers to make in-season decisions to protect environmental quality. They must reflect the impacts to soils, flora and fauna.

5. Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation study plots and actual rehabilitation efforts should be initiated, with the highest priority going to heavily used areas such as Dove Springs and Jawbone Canyon. Rehabilitation must be tied to rotation of ORV use into other suitable areas.

C. Baseline Studies

1. Scope of the ORV phenomenon

Baseline data needs to be gathered on the positive as well as negative characteristics of ORV use. Separate ecosystems, ranges, watersheds, regions of the nation, states and localized areas should be studied to gather much needed baseline data.

British Government should be held to a new standard of environmental commitment. The E.A.R. does not have a right to be consulted, both in terms of actual and potential. There is a need for a more active role for the public in the future.

Public Participation and Education

The role of the public in the E.A.R. process should be enhanced. It is necessary to ensure that the public is not only consulted but also that it is actively involved in the decision-making process. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one. The public should be given the opportunity to express its views on the proposed project and to participate in the decision-making process. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one.

Monitoring

Monitoring systems in the E.A.R. process should be developed and improved. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one. The public should be given the opportunity to express its views on the proposed project and to participate in the decision-making process. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one.

Public Participation

Public participation in the E.A.R. process should be enhanced. It is necessary to ensure that the public is not only consulted but also that it is actively involved in the decision-making process. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one. The public should be given the opportunity to express its views on the proposed project and to participate in the decision-making process. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one.

Public Participation

Public Participation

Public participation in the E.A.R. process should be enhanced. It is necessary to ensure that the public is not only consulted but also that it is actively involved in the decision-making process. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one. The public should be given the opportunity to express its views on the proposed project and to participate in the decision-making process. This will require a change in the way the public is consulted, from a passive role to an active one.

2. Environmental Impacts of ORVs

Impacts to soil, air water vegetation, wildlife species, wildlife habitat, etc., needs to be further investigated. Although a great deal of literature already exists concerning environmental impacts, more baseline input is recommended. Baseline data and impacts by type of ORVs needs to be compiled. For example, how much impact is created by 4-wheel drive vehicles, dune buggies, motorcycles, all-terrain vehicles, data equipment, specifications (tires, etc.)

3. Sociological Data on Preceptions and Preference

Surveys on the perceptions and preferences of the general public, ORV users and land managers pertaining to ORV use and management are needed to clarify the desires of each of these groups, plus the many misconceptions relating to this land use. The views of the ORV group should be on an ORV-use class level, e.g., the values and preferences of 4-wheel, competitive motorcyclists, etc. Misconceptions and misunderstanding exist not only between managers and ORV users, but also between different classes of ORV users. An understanding of these may aid in management.

4. Reclamation and Rehabilitation

Baseline information techniques of reclamation and rehabilitation of habitat is needed. Such information should delineate habitats which are not reclaimable under certain defined parameters of use. It should detail the methods to rehabilitate different types and levels if impacts on habitats which can sustain ORV use. Standards for determining feasibility of rehabilitation must be outlined.

5. Depreciative Behavior

Further data is needed into the cause of misuse and abuse of public lands by certain ORV users. These data should enable land management agencies to predict and, in some cases, forestall deviant actions of the public (i.e., vandalism, litter control, environmental degradation, etc.).

6. Ways of Mitigating Impacts

Different machines create different types and levels of impacts. The mitigations should be tied directly to the

Conducting the Study of CRY

Subjects to study the water regulation within the cell. The study is to be divided into three parts. The first part is to study the effect of the hormone on the water regulation. The second part is to study the effect of the hormone on the water regulation. The third part is to study the effect of the hormone on the water regulation.

Background from the Physiology and Biochemistry of the Plant

During the past few years, the study of the water regulation in the plant has been a subject of great interest. The study of the water regulation in the plant has been a subject of great interest. The study of the water regulation in the plant has been a subject of great interest. The study of the water regulation in the plant has been a subject of great interest.

Plant Physiology and Biochemistry

Plant physiology is the study of the functions of the plant. It is a branch of biology that deals with the study of the functions of the plant. It is a branch of biology that deals with the study of the functions of the plant. It is a branch of biology that deals with the study of the functions of the plant.

Plant Physiology - Water

The study of the water regulation in the plant is a subject of great interest. The study of the water regulation in the plant is a subject of great interest. The study of the water regulation in the plant is a subject of great interest. The study of the water regulation in the plant is a subject of great interest.

Water and the Plant

Water is a very important substance for the plant. It is a very important substance for the plant. It is a very important substance for the plant. It is a very important substance for the plant.

impact.

7. Computer Simulation Models

It should be possible to develop computer simulation models to test and predict various expected impacts created by ORVs. The validity of establishing cyclic use areas could be tested using simulation models. For example, 20 use areas on a 40-year cycle in which in any given 2 year period one area is being used while 19 are rested (2 years of use and 38 years of rest for each area in the cycle). Another alternative to be examined in the feasibility of separating conflicting recreational use, i.e., motorized vs non-motorized.

8. HCRS Coordinating Baseline Studies

The HCRS should coordinate those studies relating to sociological and behavioral recommendations so as to reduce and eliminate duplication and redundancy among federal and state land management agencies.

D. Support Needs

The above recommendations are within the capability of the agencies given policy funding and organizational levels. The land management agencies alone cannot carry the burden. At a minimum it is critical that additional support from both CEQ and Congress be made available.

1. Congress should assess the critically of the ORV situation relative to the environmental mandates of the Sikes Act, NEPA, FLPMA and the two Executive Orders. Should analysis show that the situation warrants increased funding sources, consideration should be given to providing funds at a minimum from:
 - a. The Off-Shore Oil and Gas Lease Sale Program (Outer Continental Shelf receipts)
 - b. The Land and Water Conservation Fund.
 - c. User Fees.
2. CEQ should continue to provide council and guidance to the land managing agencies. A continual external overview and environmental protection ethic for ORVs should be developed. The Council should advise the President of the severity of the off-road vehicle problems

Computer Simulation Models

It should be possible to develop computer simulation models to test and predict various proposed changes to the road network. The validity of such models can be tested by comparing predicted results with actual results. It is noted that a 10-year period is being used while 15 years is used in the model. A further adjustment to be considered in the validity of the model is the number of vehicles per hour and the number of vehicles per day.

Other Computer Simulation Models

The other computer simulation models being used are the "Traffic Flow" and "Traffic Control" models. These models are used to predict the effect of changes to the road network on traffic flow and control.

Other Models

The other models used are the "Traffic Flow" and "Traffic Control" models. These models are used to predict the effect of changes to the road network on traffic flow and control.

Computer models are also used to predict the effect of changes to the road network on traffic flow and control. These models are used to predict the effect of changes to the road network on traffic flow and control.

The other models used are the "Traffic Flow" and "Traffic Control" models. These models are used to predict the effect of changes to the road network on traffic flow and control.

The other models used are the "Traffic Flow" and "Traffic Control" models. These models are used to predict the effect of changes to the road network on traffic flow and control.

Other models

Other models used are the "Traffic Flow" and "Traffic Control" models. These models are used to predict the effect of changes to the road network on traffic flow and control.

including the regulatory, funding and organizational needs of the agencies.

3. The Department of the Interior should develop a framework of policies and goals to guide the resource management agencies in their approaches to managing ORVs. Interior agencies should all be consistent on their management.

Summary

It is within the capability of either the Bureau of Land Management or the U.S. Forest Service to develop the plans and conduct or initiate the studies called for in this paper. However, the use of ORVs and the problems associated with that use cross geopolitical and agency lines. The attainment of effective ORV management requires therefore a coordinated and concerted effort by the various concerned publics and agencies. It is our final recommendation that the Council on Environmental Quality provide not only this coordination, but serve as the interface with Congress, without whose support this problem cannot be resolved.

